

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending and stand rejected. When rejecting the claims, the Examiner failed to provide, in the detailed action, any explanation or support for the rejection of Claims 10-17, 21, and 23. Consequently, the rejection of those Claims cannot stand and any rejection made in a subsequent office action cannot be made final until the Applicants are afforded a fair opportunity to respond to the rejections of those claims. Based on the following remarks, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and pass the application on to issuance.

Objections to the Specification: The Examiner objected to the inclusion of hyperlinks in the Specification. MPEP § 608.01 (VII) defines a hyperlink as an URL placed between these symbols "< >" or http:// followed by a URL address. The specification as originally filed included a number of instance of "http://" followed by a URL address. The "http://" portion has been removed from each instance so that the specification no longer includes embedded hyperlinks as defined by the MPEP.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102: The Examiner rejected Claim 6 under §102 as being anticipated by US Pub. 2004/0221033 to Davis. Davis is directed to a method for monitoring client interaction with a resource that has been downloaded from a server. See, e.g., Davis, Abstract. Davis uses the term resource to describe CGI scripts and JAVA applets. Davis, para [0059] and [0061]. Davis discloses the retrieval, from a first server, of a web page that includes embedded URLs that point to two resources that reside on a second server. The URLs for the first resource is embedded using the tag. When attempting to render the web page, the client will automatically fetch the first resource. This forces the execution of a CGI script on the second server. The CGI script collects information from the client which includes a client identifier and the URL of the web page and stores that information in a database. The CGI script also returns a small transparent GIF image to the client. Davis paragraph [0059].

The URL for the second resource is embedded using the <APPLET> tag. When attempting to render the web page, the client will automatically fetch JAVA code provided by the second resource which is a tracking program. The Client executes the JAVA code which can measure a time duration for which the client displays the web page. When the client exits or closes the web page the JAVA applet uploads this duration to the second server so that the duration can be stored in the database along with the information collected by the CGI script – that is – the first resource. Davis, para [0061].

The database can then be parsed by client identifier to determine how often a client visited a particular web page and how long that web page was displayed. Davis, para [0062]. Davis makes no mention of using an URL to query the database for a cookie, identifying other entries in the database that include an URL for an identification service that manages resource data, and then locating a resource using that resource data.

Claim 6 is directed to a method for locating a resource and recites the following acts:

1. providing a web page having instructions to request a web bug;
2. requesting the web bug sending a cookie and an URL for the web page;
3. saving the cookie and the URL for the web page as an entry in an association table;
4. querying, providing the URL for the web page, the association table for the cookie in the entry containing the URL;
5. identifying other entries in the association table containing the cookie;
6. identifying from those entries an entry containing an URL for an identification service, the identification service managing resource data; and
7. locating the resource using the resource data.

Rejecting Claim 6, the Examiner mistakenly asserts that each of these acts is taught by Davis, para [0059]. As made clear above, Davis simply teaches collecting a client identifier and web page URL and storing that information in a database. That information is later updated with data regarding the number of times the web page has been visited and the duration of those visits. The database can be later queried to track the information.

Davis is silent as to identifying other entries in an association table or other database containing a provided cookie, identifying from those entries an entry containing an URL for an identification service where the identification service manages resource data, and then locating a resource using the resource data. Davis does not teach these acts and therefore cannot be properly used to support a §102 rejection of Claim 6.

For at least these reasons Claim 6 is patentable over Davis.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103: The Examiner rejected Claims 1-5 and 7-25 under §103 as being unpatentable over USPN 6,490,624 issued to Sampson in view of US Pub. 2002/0099850 to Faber. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the Examiner must show some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings; that there is a reasonable expectation of success; and that the prior art reference (or references when combined) teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP § 2142.

Sampson is directed to session management in a stateless network such as the Internet. See, e.g., Sampson, Title and Abstract. Sampson's system includes a number of access servers each of which acts as a gatekeeper for a protected server. Session information for a given client is stored in a session manager bound to an access server. In operation a client logs into an access server for a first protected server and then submits a request for a resource of a second protected server. The session manager for the access server determines whether the client has any authenticated sessions with any other access servers. If so, the client is permitted to